arXiv:1402.3573v2 [cs.DM] 19 May 2015

Tree 3-spanners of diameter at most 5

Ioannis Papoutsakis
Kastelli Pediados, Heraklion, Crete, Greece, 700 06

May 20, 2015

Abstract

Tree spanners approximate distances within graphs; a subtree of a graph is a tree t-spanner of the graph if and only if for every pair of vertices their distance in the subtree is at most t times their distance in the graph. When a graph contains a subtree of diameter at most t, then trivially admits a tree t-spanner. Now, determining whether a graph admits a tree t-spanner of diameter at most $t+1$ is an NP complete problem, when $t \geq 4$, and it is tractable, when $t \leq 3$. Although it is not known whether it is tractable to decide graphs that admit a tree 3-spanner of any diameter, an efficient algorithm to determine graphs that admit a tree 3-spanner of diameter at most 5 is presented. Moreover, it is proved that if a graph of diameter at most 3 admits a tee 3-spanner, then it admits a tree 3-spanner of diameter at most 5. Hence, this algorithm decides tree 3-spanner admissibility of diameter at most 3 graphs.

Keywords. tree spanner, efficient graph algorithm, diameter, spanning tree, low stretch

1 Introduction

There are applications of spanners in a variety of areas, such as distributed computing [2, 23], communication networks [21, 22], motion planning and robotics [1, 9], phylogenetic analysis [3] and in embedding finite metric spaces in graphs approximately [25]. In [24] it is mentioned that spanners have applications in approximation algorithms for geometric spaces [17], various approximation algorithms [12] and solving diagonally dominant linear systems [26].

On one hand, in [4, 8, 7] an efficient algorithm to decide tree 2-spanner admissible graphs is presented, where a method to construct all the tree 2-spanners of a graph is also given. On the other hand, in [8, 7] it is proved that for each $t \geq 4$ the problem to decide graphs that admit a tree t-spanner is an NP-complete problem. The complexity status of the tree 3-spanner problem is unresolved. In [13], for every t, an efficient algorithm to determine whether a planar graph with bounded face length admits a tree t-spanner is presented. Also, for every t, an efficient algorithm to decide tree t-spanner admissibility of bounded degree graphs is presented in [20].

Tree t-spanners ($t \geq 3$) have been studied for various families of graphs. If a connected graph is a cograph or a split graph or the complement of a bipartite graph, then it admits a tree 3-spanner [7]. Also, all convex bipartite graphs have a tree 3-spanner, which can be constructed in linear time [27]. Efficient algorithms to recognize graphs that admit a tree 3-spanner have been developed for interval, permutation and regular bipartite graphs [15], planar graphs [13], directed path graphs [14], very strongly chordal graphs, 1-split graphs, and chordal graphs of diameter at most 2 [6]. This last result is extended in this paper to diameter at most 3 general graphs, as shown in theorem 2.

Moreover, every strongly chordal graph admits a tree 4-spanner, which can be constructed in linear time [5]; note that, for each t, there is a connected chordal graph that does not admit any tree t-spanner. In [6] it is also presented a linear time algorithm that finds a tree t-spanner in a small diameter chordal graph. In [16] the tree t-spanner problem is studied for diametrically uniform graphs. An approximation algorithm for the tree t-spanner problem is presented in [11, 10], where a new necessary condition for a graph to have a tree t-spanner in terms of decomposition is also presented.

There are NP-completeness results for the tree t-spanner problem for families of graphs. In [13], it is shown that it is NP-hard to determine the minimum t for which a planar graph admits a tree t-spanner. For any $t \geq 4$, the tree t-spanner problem is NP-complete on chordal graphs of diameter at most $t + 1$, when t is even, and of diameter at most $t + 2$, when t is odd [6]; note that this refers to the diameter of the graph not to the diameter of the spanner. In [19] it is shown that the problem to determine whether a graph admits a tree t-spanner of diameter at most $t + 1$ is tractable, when $t \leq 3$, while it is an NP-complete problem, when $t \geq 4$. For example, deciding graphs that admit a tree 4-spanner of diameter at most 5 is an NP-complete problem. In this paper, an efficient algorithm to decide graphs that admit a tree 3-spanner of diameter at most 5 is presented (theorem 1).

The tree 3-spanner problem is very interesting, since its complexity status is unresolved. In [18] it is shown that only for $t = 3$ the union of any two tree t-spanners of any given graph may contain big induced cycles but never an odd induced cycle (other than a triangle); such unions are proved to be perfect graphs. The algorithm presented in [20] is efficient only for $t \leq 3$, when graphs with maximum degree $O(\log n)$ are considered, where n is the number of vertices of each graph. The tree 3-spanner problem can be formulated as an integer programming optimization problem. Constraints for such a formulation appear in [18], providing certificates of tree 3-spanner inadmissibility for some graphs.

2 Definitions and lemmas

In general, terminology of [28] is used. Let G be a graph. Then, $V(G)$ is its vertex set and $E(G)$ its edge set. An edge between vertices $u, v \in G$ is denoted as uv. Let v be a vertex of G, then $N_G(v)$ is the set of G neighbors of v, while

$N_G[v]$ is $N_G(v) \cup \{v\}$; in this paper we consider graphs without loop edges, so $v \notin N_G(v)$. The closed and open neighborhoods of a subgraph H of G are defined as follows: $N_G[H] = \bigcup_{x \in V(H)} N_G[x]$ and $N_G(H) = N_G[H] \setminus V(H)$. If H is a subgraph of G, then $G[H]$ is the subgraph of G induced by the vertices of H, i.e. $G[H]$ contains all the vertices of H and all the edges of G between vertices of H. The G distance between two connected in G to each other vertices u, v is the length of a u, v shortest path in G and it is denoted as $d_G(u, v)$. The diameter of a graph is the maximum distance among pairs of vertices of the graph. The components of G are its maximal connected subgraphs. Also, a block of G is a maximal connected subgraph of G with no cut-vertex, where a cut-vertex is a vertex whose deletion increases the number of components of G.

Let f, g be functions from the set of all graphs to the non negative integers. Then, f is $O(g)$ if and only if there are graph G_0 and integer M such that $f(G) \leq Mg(G)$ for every G with $|V(G)| > |V(G_0)|$. The definition of a tree t-spanner follows.

Definition 1 *A graph T is a tree t-spanner of a graph G if and only if T is a subgraph of G that is a tree and, for every pair u and v of vertices of G, if u and v are at distance d from each other in G, then u and v are at distance at most $t \cdot d$ from each other in T.*

Finding the minimum t for which a given graph admits a tree t-spanner is known as the minimum max-stretch spanning tree problem. Note that in order to check whether a spanning tree of a graph G is a tree t-spanner of G, it suffices to examine pairs of adjacent in G vertices. To focus on trees that have diameter at most 5, the concept of a 5-center is introduced.

Definition 2 *A 5-center of a tree T consists of a pair of adjacent in T vertices u and v, such that all vertices of T are within distance 2 from u or v in T.*

Clearly, if a tree admits a 5-center, then it has diameter at most 5. Also, if a tree has diameter at most 5 and contains at least one edge, then it admits a 5-center. A frequently used lemma follows.

Lemma 1 *Let G be a graph and T a tree 3-spanner of G. If u is in a p, q-path of T and p, q are not in $N_T[u]$, then every p, q-path of G contains a vertex in $N_T[u]$.*

Proof. Consider the components of $T \setminus u$. Obviously, vertices p and q belong to different such components. Therefore, for any p, q-path P' of G there is an edge ww' in P' such that w and w' are also in different such components. Since all the tree paths connecting vertices of different such components pass through u, it holds that $d_T(w, w') = d_T(w, u) + d_T(u, w')$. But the tree distance between w and w' can be at most 3; therefore, at least one of w or w' is at distance at most 1 from u in T. □

It turns out that it suffices to examine tree 3-spanners with a 5-center whose vertices are as close to the 5-center as possible.

Definition 3 *A tree 3-spanner T of a graph G is uv-concentrated if and only if all of the following hold:*

1. *pair u, v is a 5-center of T,*
2. *all G neighbors of u that are closer in T to u than to v are also T neighbors of u, and*
3. *all G neighbors of v that are closer in T to v than to u are also T neighbors of v.*

Lemma 2 *If G admits a tree 3-spanner with 5-center uv, then G admits a uv-concentrated tree 3-spanner.*

Proof. Let T be a tree 3-spanner of G with 5-center uv and let w be a vertex of T which certifies that T is not uv-concentrated. Without loss of generality, assume that w is a G neighbor of u, that w is closer in T to u than to v, and that w is not a T neighbor of u. Hence, w is a leaf of T. Let q be the T neighbor of w. Then, graph T' with vertex set $V(T)$ and edge set $(E(T) \setminus \{wq\}) \cup \{wu\}$ is a tree 3-spanner of G with 5-center uv. But T' has fewer than T vertices which certify that T' is not uv-concentrated. □

3 Description of the algorithm

An algorithm to decide whether a given graph G admits a tree 3-spanner of diameter at most 5 is described. The main function of this algorithm is named `T3SD5`, appears in figure 1, and calls other functions that appear in succeeding figures. If G has no edges, then G suffices to be connected in order to admit a tree spanner. So, after handling this trivial case, algorithm `T3SD5` starts examining each edge of G, since each edge may be the central edge of an anticipated tree 3-spanner of G. So, given an edge uv of G, the components of $G \setminus N_G[u, v]$ are stored in set $\mathcal{Q}$. Of course, if $\mathcal{Q}$ is empty, then G immediately admits a small diameter (at most 3) tree 3-spanner. The key idea of this algorithm is to examine each member of $\mathcal{Q}$. Using lemma 1, one can prove that each component in $\mathcal{Q}$ is completely placed on one side (towards u or towards v) of a tree 3-spanner of G with central edge uv.

Consider the case of a tree 3-spanner T of G for which a component Q in $\mathcal{Q}$ is placed on the side of u, for example. Then, some other components must follow Q and also some vertices in $N_G(u, v)$ must be placed on the same side as Q. To collect these implications in an orderly manner, given Q and u, a structure C is formed by calling function `Get_structure` in figure 2. There, Q^x is the component of $G \setminus N_G[x]$ that contains Q, where $x = u$ in this call of function `Get_structure`. First, all components of $\mathcal{Q}$ that are in Q^x must follow Q and are placed in set $C.M$ of structure C; the coMponents of C. Second, the remaining vertices of Q^x (these are neighbors of v) must also follow Q. These vertices will be at distance 2 from u in T (because they are not neighbors of u) and are stored in set $C.U$; the Up vertices of C. Third the neighbors of Q^x

Algorithm T3SD5(G)
Input. A graph G.

If $(E(G) = \emptyset)$
  If $(|V(G)| \leq 1)$ **return** YES; **else return** NO /*(1)
For (edge uv in G){
  $\mathcal{Q} = \{Q \subseteq G : Q$ is a component of $G \setminus N_G[u, v]\}$
  If $(\mathcal{Q} = \emptyset)$ **return** YES /*(2)
  $\mathcal{C}^u = \emptyset$; $\mathcal{C}^v = \emptyset$
  do{
    Pick $Q \in \mathcal{Q} \setminus \bigcup_{X \in \mathcal{C}^u} X.M$
    $\mathcal{C}^u = \mathcal{C}^u \cup \{$**Get_structure**$(G, u, \mathcal{Q}, Q)\}$
  }**while** $(\mathcal{Q} \supset \bigcup_{X \in \mathcal{C}^u} X.M)$
  do{
    Pick $Q \in \mathcal{Q} \setminus \bigcup_{X \in \mathcal{C}^v} X.M$
    $\mathcal{C}^v = \mathcal{C}^v \cup \{$**Get_structure**$(G, v, \mathcal{Q}, Q)\}$
  }**while** $(\mathcal{Q} \supset \bigcup_{X \in \mathcal{C}^v} X.M)$
  $\Gamma =$ **Create_graph**$(\mathcal{C}^u, \mathcal{C}^v)$
  If (**Check_clique**$(\Gamma, \mathcal{C}^u, \mathcal{C}^v, \mathcal{Q})$) **return** YES /*(3)
}
return NO

Figure 1: Algorithm T3SD5(G) that decides whether G admits a tree 3-spanner of diameter at most 5. Note that immediately after executing a return command the algorithm halts.

Function Get_structure$(G, x, \mathcal{Q}, Q)$
Input. A graph G, a vertex x, a set of components $\mathcal{Q}$, and a component Q.

New structure C
Let Q^x be the component of $G \setminus N_G[x]$ that contains Q.
$C.M = \{X \in \mathcal{Q} : X \subseteq Q^x\}$
$C.U = Q^x \setminus \bigcup C.M$
$C.D = N_G(Q^x)$
$C.R = \{z \in C.D : N_G(z) \supseteq Q^x\}$
return C

Figure 2: Function Get_structure$(G, x, \mathcal{Q}, Q)$.

must follow Q again. They can be at distance 1 from u in T (because they are neighbors of u) and are stored in set $C.D$; the Down vertices of C. Finally, fourth, it can be proved that all vertices in Q^x are adjacent in T to one vertex in $C.D$. Set $C.R$ stores all such candidates; the Representatives of C.

Function Create_graph$(\mathcal{C}^u, \mathcal{C}^v)$
Input. `Two disjoint sets of structures.`

$V = \{X \in \mathcal{C}^u \cup \mathcal{C}^v : X.R \neq \emptyset\}$
$E = \{XY \in V^2 : (X \in \mathcal{C}^u$ `AND` $Y \in \mathcal{C}^u)$ `OR`
$(X \in \mathcal{C}^v$ `AND` $Y \in \mathcal{C}^v)$ `OR`
$(X \in \mathcal{C}^u$ `AND` $Y \in \mathcal{C}^v$ `AND` $X.M \cap Y.M = \emptyset$ `AND`
$(X.U \cup X.D) \cap (Y.U \cup Y.D) = \emptyset)\}$
return (V, E)

Figure 3: Function `Create_graph`$(\mathcal{C}^u, \mathcal{C}^v)$.

All these structures are placed in sets $\mathcal{C}^u$ and $\mathcal{C}^v$. The aim is to tile these structures of implications in a way that a tree 3-spanner is formed if possible. Towards this aim, a graph Γ is formed based on these structures by calling function `Create_graph` in figure 3. Each structure becomes a vertex of Γ and edges are placed between compatible structures. Note that Γ is the complement of a bipartite graph. To achieve this aim, graph Γ must contain some clique of structures that covers all the components in $\mathcal{Q}$; this is decided by calling function `Check_clique` in figure 4. There, if a component in $\mathcal{Q}$ belongs only in one structure, then this structure must be in the clique and all its non neighbors must not. Finally, having such a clique of Γ, one can find a tree 3-spanner of G of diameter at most 5, using function `FT3SD5` in figure 5. Note that the clique suggested here produces a spanner that has as many components of $\mathcal{Q}$ on the side of u as possible.

4 Proof of correctness

Lemma 3 *Assume that algorithm* `T3SD5` *in figure 1 is run on input a graph G and that edge uv is examined in its* `for` *loop. Also, assume that set $\mathcal{Q}$ formed upon uv is not empty. Then*[1]*, for every component $W \in \mathcal{Q}$, there exists a unique structure $C \in \mathcal{C}^u$, such that $W \in C.M$.*

Proof. Since $\mathcal{Q}$ is not empty the algorithm proceeds with the construction of set of structures $\mathcal{C}^u$ through its first `do-while` loop. At each step of this construction, function `Get_structure` (figure 2) is called and a subset of $\mathcal{Q}$ is placed in the returned structure; also, this structure is added to $\mathcal{C}^u$. The construction proceeds to the next step, until all components of $\mathcal{Q}$ are placed in various

[1]Note that the conclusion of the lemma holds for v as well: for every component $W \in \mathcal{Q}$, there exists a unique structure $C \in \mathcal{C}^v$, such that $W \in C.M$.

Function Check_clique$(\Gamma, \mathcal{C}^u, \mathcal{C}^v, \mathcal{Q})$
Input. A graph Γ and two disjoint sets $\mathcal{C}^u$ and $\mathcal{C}^v$ that cover its vertex set.

$K = \emptyset$; $V = V(\Gamma)$
flag = $(\mathcal{Q} \subseteq \bigcup_{X \in V} X.M)$
while $(\mathcal{Q} \supset (\bigcup_{X \in \mathcal{C}^u \cap V} X.M) \cup (\bigcup_{X \in K} X.M)$ AND flag){
  $K = K \cup \{X \in \mathcal{C}^v \cap V$: there exists $Q \in X.M$
    such that $Q \notin \bigcup_{Y \in \mathcal{C}^u \cap V} Y.M\}$ /*(1)
  $V = V \setminus \{X \in V$: there exists $Y \in K$
    such that $XY \notin E(\Gamma)\}$
  flag = $(\mathcal{Q} \subseteq \bigcup_{X \in V} X.M)$
  }
If (flag) **return** 1; **else return** 0

Figure 4: Function Check_clique$(\Gamma, \mathcal{C}^u, \mathcal{C}^v, \mathcal{Q})$.

structures. The do-while loop of this construction terminates, because,first, at each step at least one non placed yet component is placed and, second, function Get_structure always returns. So, there exists a structure $C \in \mathcal{C}^u$, such that $W \in C.M$.

To form C function Get_structure is called with input $(G, u, \mathcal{Q}, Q)$, where Q is some component in $\mathcal{Q}$. Assume that there is another structure $C' \in \mathcal{C}^u$, such that $W \in C'.M$. Again, C' must be formed by calling function Get_structure with input $(G, u, \mathcal{Q}, Q')$, where Q' is some component in $\mathcal{Q}$. Both of Q and Q' must be in the component of $G \setminus N_G[u]$ that contains W, so $Q \in C'.M$ and $Q' \in C.M$. Without loss of generality, assume that structure C is formed first. Since $Q' \in C.M$, algorithm T3SD5 cannot pick Q' in order to call function Get_structure with input $(G, u, \mathcal{Q}, Q')$, a contradiction. □

Lemma 4 *Let G be a graph that admits a uv-concentrated tree 3-spanner T. Let W be a component of $G \setminus N_G[u, v]$. Assume that W contains a vertex which is at distance 2 from u in T. Then, algorithm* T3SD5 *in figure 1 on input G returns* YES *or the following hold:*

1. *There exists a structure $C \in \mathcal{C}^u$, such that $W \in C.M$, where $\mathcal{C}^u$ is the set of structures constructed by algorithm* T3SD5 *on input G, when edge uv is examined in its* for *loop.*
2. *There exists an $r \in C.D$, such that every vertex in $C.U \cup \bigcup C.M$ is adjacent to r in T.*
3. *Every vertex in $C.D$ is adjacent to u in T.*

Proof. Assume that algorithm T3SD5 is run on input G. If it has not not returned YES, edge uv of G is examined in its for loop. So, set $\mathcal{Q}$ is formed based on u

and v. Here, $\mathcal{Q}$ contains at least one component, namely W, so it is not empty. So, by lemma 3 there exists a structure $C \in \mathcal{C}^u$, such that $W \in C.M$.

Let p be the vertex of W which it is known to be at distance 2 from u in T. Then, there is a vertex r, such that pr and ru are edges of T. Assume that there is a vertex q in $X.U \cup \bigcup X.M$ that is not adjacent to r in T. There is a path from q to u in T. This path avoids p, because p is a leaf (u, v is a 5-center of T and p is not in $N_G[u, v]$). It also avoids r, because all T neighbors of r but u are leaves (u, v is a 5-center of T and r is adjacent to u in T) different than q. So, u is in the tree path from p to q and u is not a T neighbor of either p or q (note that $q \notin N_G[u]$). There is a path from p to q in $G \setminus N_G[u]$, because $G[C.U \cup \bigcup C.M] = Q^x$ (figure 2; note that $x = u$ here) and Q^x is a connected graph that doesn't overlap with $N_G[u]$. But this is a contradiction to lemma 1. Therefore, every vertex in $C.U \cup \bigcup C.M$ is adjacent to r in T. Clearly, p belongs to Q^x and r doesn't belong to Q^x. So, r belongs to $N_G(Q^x)$ and therefore belongs to $C.D$.

Let w be in $C.D$. All T neighbors of r but u are leaves and every vertex in $C.U \cup \bigcup C.M = Q^x$ is adjacent to r in T. So, w must be within distance 2 from r, because w is a G neighbor of a vertex in Q^x and T is a 3-spanner of G. Here, w cannot be adjacent to r, because T is uv-concentrated. The T path of length 2 from w to r must contain u, because u is the only non leaf neighbor of r. This makes w adjacent to u in T. □

Lemma 5 *Let $\mathcal{Q}$ be the set of components of $G \setminus N_G[u, v]$, where G is a graph, uv an edge of G and $\mathcal{Q}$ is not empty. Also, let $\mathcal{C}^u$ and $\mathcal{C}^v$ be the sets of structures formed when edge uv is examined by algorithm* `T3SD5` *in figure 1 on input G. Finally, let Γ be the graph constructed by the algorithm upon $\mathcal{C}^u$ and $\mathcal{C}^v$. Then, function* `Check_clique` *in figure 4 on input $(\Gamma, \mathcal{C}^u, \mathcal{C}^v, \mathcal{Q})$ returns 1 if and only if Γ contains a clique L such that $\bigcup_{X \in L} X.M = \mathcal{Q}$.*

Proof. Assume that Γ contains a clique L such that $\bigcup_{X \in L} X.M = \mathcal{Q}$. Whenever the conditions of the `while` loop of function `Check_clique` are checked, $K \subseteq L \subseteq V$; this is proved by induction on the number of times these conditions are checked. Let the base case be the first time the `while` statement is executed. At this point $K = \emptyset$ and $V = V(\Gamma)$, so $K \subseteq L \subseteq V(\Gamma)$. For the induction step, first, each X added to K is the only vertex in V that contains (in its X.M) a specific component Q of $\mathcal{Q}$, because Q is not contained in any vertex in $\mathcal{C}^u \cap V$ (see condition (1) in figure 4) and Q is contained in a unique structure-vertex of $\mathcal{C}^v$ (lemma 3). So, $X \in L$, because $\bigcup_{X \in L} X.M = \mathcal{Q}$ and $L \subseteq V$ (from the induction hypothesis). Therefore, $K \subseteq L$. Second, from V are removed all the vertices that are not adjacent to at least one vertex of K, but none of these vertices can be in L, since $K \subseteq L$ and L is a clique. So, $L \subseteq V$.

Boolean variable `flag` remains equal to 1 during the execution of the `while` statement of function `Check_clique`, because $\bigcup_{X \in L} X.M = \mathcal{Q}$ and $L \subseteq V$. If at some step of the `while` execution set K is not increased, then $\bigcup_{X \in (\mathcal{C}^v \cap V) \setminus K} X.M \subseteq \bigcup_{X \in \mathcal{C}^v \cap V} X.M$. But $V \subseteq \mathcal{C}^v \cup \mathcal{C}^u$, by construction of graph Γ (figure 3), and $Q \subseteq \bigcup_{X \in V} X.M$, because `flag` is 1. So, $\mathcal{Q} \subseteq (\bigcup_{X \in \mathcal{C}^u \cap V} X.M) \cup (\bigcup_{X \in K} X.M)$

and the `while` loop terminates. But K can't increase for ever, because it is bounded by $\mathcal{C}^v \cap V$. So, the `while` loop does terminate and, of course, the function returns 1.

Assume that function `Check_clique` returns 1. Then, `flag` is equal to 1 and the `while` statement terminates. So, $Q \subseteq (\bigcup_{X \in \mathcal{C}^u \cap V} X.M) \cup (\bigcup_{X \in K} X.M)$. Set L equal to $(\mathcal{C}^u \cap V) \cup K$. But for every $X \in V(\Gamma)$ it holds that $X.M \subseteq \mathcal{Q}$. So, $\bigcup_{X \in L} X.M = \mathcal{Q}$.

First, $K \subseteq \mathcal{C}^v \cap V(\Gamma)$ (see formation of set K in command (1) in figure 4). Vertices in $\mathcal{C}^v \cap V(\Gamma)$ form a clique, because of definition of edge set of Γ in figure 3. So, K forms a clique in Γ. Second, there is no vertex in V which is not adjacent to all vertices in K. Therefore L forms a clique in Γ. □

Theorem 1 *A graph G admits a tree 3-spanner of diameter at most 5 if and only if algorithm* `T3SD5` *in figure 1 on input G returns* `YES`*.*

Proof. On one hand assume that a graph G admits a tree 3-spanner T' of diameter at most 5. If G has no edges, then G must have at most one vertex. Then, in this case, algorithm `T3SD5` on input G returns `YES`. So, assume that G has at least one edge. Then, T' contains at least one edge too. So, since T' has diameter at most 5, T' contains two adjacent vertices u and v that form a 5-center of T'. Therefore, by lemma 2, G admits a uv-concentrated tree 3-spanner T.

Algorithm `T3SD5` on input G starts examining edges through its `for` loop. If the algorithm has not returned `YES` yet, it examines edge uv. Then, set of components $\mathcal{Q}$ is formed. If $\mathcal{Q}$ is empty, the algorithm returns `YES`. So, assume that $\mathcal{Q}$ is not empty. Therefore, sets $\mathcal{C}^u$ and $\mathcal{C}^v$ are constructed and upon these sets graph Γ is built. Let A be the subset of $\mathcal{C}^u$ such that $X \in A$ if and only if a vertex in a component in $X.M$ is at distance 2 from u in T. So, according to lemma 4 (conclusion 2), for every $X \in A$, there exists an $r \in X.D$, such that every edge from r to $X.U \cup V(\bigcup X.M)$ belongs to T. So, for every $X \in A$, $X.R \neq \emptyset$. Therefore, $A \subseteq V(\Gamma)$ (vertex set formation of function `Create_graph` in figure 3). Similarly, $B \subseteq V(\Gamma)$, where B is the subset of $\mathcal{C}^v$ such that $X \in B$ if and only if a vertex in a component in $X.M$ is at distance 2 from v in T.

First, graph Γ contains all the edges between its vertices that belong to $\mathcal{C}^u$ (edge set in function `Create_graph`). Since all structures in A belong to $\mathcal{C}^u$, A forms a clique in Γ; similarly B forms a clique in Γ. Second, let $X \in A$ and $Y \in B$. All vertices in $X.U \cup V(\bigcup X.M)$ are adjacent in T to a vertex in $X.D$ and all vertices in $X.D$ are adjacent to u in T, because of conclusions 2 and 3 of lemma 4. So, every vertex in $X.D \cup X.U \cup V(\bigcup X.M)$ is connected to u in T through a path that avoids v. Similarly, every vertex in $Y.D \cup Y.U \cup V(\bigcup Y.M)$ is connected to v in T through a path that avoids u. So, sets $X.D \cup X.U \cup V(\bigcup X.M)$ and $Y.D \cup Y.U \cup V(\bigcup Y.M)$ must be disjoint, because otherwise T would contain a cycle, since $uv \in T$. Therefore, edge XY is in Γ (see definition of edge set in function `Create_graph`). From these two facts, $A \cup B$ forms a clique in Γ.

Every component Q in $\mathcal{Q}$ contains a vertex at T distance 2 from u or v, because $Q \cap N_G[u, v] = \emptyset$ and u, v form a 5-center of T. So, there is an X in

$A \cup B$ such that $Q \in X.M$, because of the definitions of A and B and lemma 3. Therefore, $A \cup B$ is a clique of Γ that covers all the components in $\mathcal{Q}$. Then, by lemma 5, function `Check_clique` on input $(\Gamma, \mathcal{C}^u, \mathcal{C}^v, \mathcal{Q})$ returns 1 and, therefore, algorithm `T3SD5` on input G returns `YES`.

On the other hand assume that algorithm `T3SD5` on input G returns `YES`. The algorithm returns `YES` in 3 cases. First, command (1) in figure 1. Then, G has no edges and at most one vertex, so it trivially admits a tree 3-spanner of diameter at most 5. Second, command (2), while examining some edge uv of G. Then, Q is empty. This means that $N_G[u, v]$ covers G. In this case let T be the spanning tree of G with edge set $\{ux : x \in N_G(u)\} \cup \{vx : x \in N_G(v) \setminus N_G[u]\}$. Then, T is a tree 3-spanner of diameter at most 3.

Function FT3SD5$(G, \mathcal{C}^u, \mathcal{C}^v, L)$
Input. A graph G and appropriate sets of structures based on G.

$V = V(G)$
$E_U = \emptyset$; $E_D = \emptyset$
For (structure X in L){
  Pick $r \in X.R$
  $E_U = E_U \cup \{rx : x \in X.U \cup \bigcup X.M\}$
  If $(X \in \mathcal{C}^u)$
    $E_D = E_D \cup \{ux : x \in X.D\}$
  If $(X \in \mathcal{C}^v)$
    $E_D = E_D \cup \{vx : x \in X.D\}$
}
$V_L = \bigcup_{X \in L}(X.U \cup X.D)$
$E' = \{ux : x \in N_G(u) \setminus V_L\} \cup \{vx : x \in N_G(v) \setminus (N_G[u] \cup V_L)\}$
$E = E' \cup E_U \cup E_D$
return (V, E)

Figure 5: Function `FT3SD5`$(G, \mathcal{C}^u, \mathcal{C}^v, L)$ that returns a tree 3-spanner of G of diameter at most 5. Here, L can be equal to $(\mathcal{C}^u \cap V) \cup K$, where sets V and K are constructed in function `Check_clique`

Third, command (3) of algorithm `T3SD5`. Then, for some edge uv of G function `Check_clique` in figure 4 on input $(\Gamma, \mathcal{C}^u, \mathcal{C}^v, \mathcal{Q})$ returns 1, where $\Gamma, \mathcal{C}^u, \mathcal{C}^v, \mathcal{Q}$ are constructed by the algorithm upon edge uv. So, by lemma 5, Γ contains a clique L such that $\bigcup_{X \in L} X.M = \mathcal{Q}$. In the proof of this lemma some such L is presented and it is equal to $(\mathcal{C}^u \cap V) \cup K$, where sets V and K are constructed in function `Check_clique`. Given this L, let T be the graph returned by function `FT3SD5` of figure 5 on input $(G, \mathcal{C}^u, \mathcal{C}^v, L)$.

For each $Q \in \mathcal{Q}$ there is a unique $X \in L$ such that $Q \in X.M$. To see this, first, $\bigcup_{X \in L} X.M = \mathcal{Q}$, so there is at least one $X \in L$ such that $Q \in X.M$.

Second, assume that there is another $Y \in L$, such that $Q \in Y.M$. If both X and Y belong to $\mathcal{C}^u$, then this is a contradiction to lemma 3; the same holds if they both belong to $\mathcal{C}^v$. Without loss of generality, assume that $X \in \mathcal{C}^u$ and $Y \in \mathcal{C}^v$. But L is a clique of Γ, so edge XY is in Γ. By construction of edge set of Γ (figure 3), $X.M \cap Y.M = \emptyset$, a contradiction. Therefore, each vertex in $\bigcup \mathcal{Q}$ has degree 1, because in function `FT3SD5` each $X \in L$ is examined only once and one sole edge is added to each vertex in $\bigcup X.M$ (see formation of set E_U).

Let $x \in \bigcup_{X \in L} X.U$. So, there is an $X_x \in L$, such that $x \in X_x.U$. Assume there is another $Y_x \in L$, such that $x \in Y_x.U$. First, assume that $X_x \in \mathcal{C}^u$ and $Y_x \in \mathcal{C}^v$. But L is a clique of Γ, so edge X_xY_x is in Γ. By construction of edge set of Γ (figure 3), $X_x.U \cap Y_x.U = \emptyset$, a contradiction. Second, assuming that $X_x \in \mathcal{C}^v$ and $Y_x \in \mathcal{C}^u$ similarly leads to a contradiction. Third, assume that both X_x and Y_x belong to $\mathcal{C}^u$. To form X_x function `Get_structure` (figure 2) is called with input $(G, u, \mathcal{Q}, Q)$, where Q is some component in $\mathcal{Q}$. Also, Y_x must be formed by calling function `Get_structure` with input $(G, u, \mathcal{Q}, Q')$, where Q' is some component in $\mathcal{Q}$. Both of Q and Q' must be in the component of $G \setminus N_G[u]$ that contains x, so $Q \in Y_x.M$ and $Q' \in X_x.M$. Without loss of generality, assume that structure X_x is formed first. Since $Q' \in X_x.M$, algorithm `T3SD5` cannot pick Q' in order to call function `Get_structure` with input $(G, u, \mathcal{Q}, Q')$, a contradiction. Fourth, similarly, assuming that both X_x and Y_x belong to $\mathcal{C}^v$ leads to a contradiction. All four cases lead to a contradiction, therefore, for each $x \in \bigcup_{X \in L} X.U$ there is a unique $X_x \in L$ such that $x \in X_x.U$. Hence, each vertex in $\bigcup_{X \in L} X.U$ has degree 1, because in function `FT3SD5` each $X \in L$ is examined only once and one sole edge is added to each vertex in $X.U$ (see formation of set E_U).

Let $A = \bigcup_{X \in L}(X.U \cup \bigcup X.M)$. First, each vertex in A is adjacent in T to a vertex in $\bigcup_{X \in L} X.D$, by formation of set E_U in function `FT3SD5`. Second, $A \cap \bigcup_{X \in L} X.D = \emptyset$; to see this consider a $y \in Y.D$, where $Y \in L$. Without loss of generality, assume that $Y \in \mathcal{C}^u$. Towards a contradiction, assume that there is a $Z \in L$, such that $y \in Z.U \cup \bigcup Z.M$. Here, y cannot be in $\bigcup Z.M$, because $Z.M$ is a set of components of $G \setminus N[u, v]$ and $y \in N_G(u)$ (see figure 2). So, y must be in $Z.U$. On one hand, assume that $Z \in \mathcal{C}^u$; then $Z.U$ is subset of a component of $G \setminus N_G[u]$ and $y \in N_G(u)$, a contradiction. On the other hand, assume that $Z \in \mathcal{C}^u$; then, since L is a clique, edge YZ is in Γ. But this means that $Y.U \cap Z.D = \emptyset$ (see formation of edge set in figure 3), a contradiction. Third, as proved in the previous paragraphs, each vertex in A is a pendant vertex of T. Let $\bar{A} = V(G) \setminus A$. Therefore, from these three facts, in order to prove that T is a tree it suffices to prove that $T[\bar{A}]$ is a tree.

Set $\bar{A}$ is partitioned in $\bar{A} \cap V_L$ and $\bar{A} \setminus V_L$, where V_L is defined in function `FT3SD5`. On one hand, set $\bar{A} \cap V_L$ is equal to $\bigcup_{X \in L} X.D$, because $\bigcup_{X \in L} X.U \subseteq A$ and $A \cap \bigcup_{X \in L} X.D = \emptyset$ (see definition of A and second fact of previous paragraph). Then, by formation of edge set E_D in function `FT3SD5`, each vertex in $\bar{A} \cap V_L$ can be adjacent only to u or to v in T. Assume, towards a contradiction, that a vertex $w \in \bar{A} \cap V_L$ is adjacent to both u and v in T. Then, there must be a $Y \in L$, such that $Y \in \mathcal{C}^u$ and $w \in Y.D$, because edge $uw \in T$. Also, there must be a $Z \in L$, such that $Z \in \mathcal{C}^v$ and $w \in Z.D$, because edge $vw \in T$. But L

is a clique, so YZ is an edge of Γ and, therefore, $Y.D \cap Z.D = \emptyset$ (see formation of edge set of Γ in figure 3), a contradiction. So, every vertex in $\bar{A} \cap V_L$ is a pendant vertex adjacent in $T[\bar{A}]$ to a vertex outside of $\bar{A} \cap V_L$. Also, by the formation of edge set E' in function `FT3SD5`, it is easily seen that $T[\bar{A} \setminus V_L]$ is a tree (note that $\bar{A} \subseteq N_G[u, v]$). Therefore, $T[\bar{A}]$ is a tree, which makes T also a tree.

Each vertex in $\bar{A}$ is adjacent in T to u or to v. Also, each vertex in A is adjacent to a vertex in $\bar{A}$. So, every vertex of G is within distance 2 from $\{u, v\}$ in T. Therefore, T has diameter at most 5; note that edge uv is in T (see edge set E' in function `FT3SD5`).

Consider any edge of G. If both of its endpoints are in $\bar{A}$, then each of them is within distance 1 from u or v in T; so, they are within distance 3 apart in T. Therefore, in order to prove that T is a 3-spanner of G it suffices to examine edges with at least one endpoint in A. Let w be a vertex in A. Then, there is a (unique) $Y \in L$, such that $w \in Y.U \cup \bigcup Y.M$. By construction of structure Y (see figure 2), $N_G(w) \subseteq Y.D \cup Y.U \cup \bigcup Y.M$. All vertices in $Y.U \cup \bigcup Y.M$ (including w) are adjacent in T to the same vertex of $Y.D$ (see formation of edge set E_U in function `FT3SD5`). Also, all vertices in $Y.D$ are adjacent in T to the same vertex, u or v. So, each vertex in $N_G(w)$ is within distance 3 in T from w. □

5 Conclusions

Algorithm `T3SD5` described in section 3 is clearly efficient. Let $n(G) = |V(G)|$ be a function from the set of graphs to the non negative integers. Then, the `for` loop of the algorithm, that examines each edge of the input graph, is executed $O(n^2)$ times. At the beginning of each execution of this loop is the formation of set $\mathcal{Q}$, which can be done easily in $O(n^2)$ time. Next, each `do-while` loop is executed $O(n)$ times; to see this consider the formation of set $\mathcal{C}^u$: at each execution of the corresponding loop $\bigcup_{X \in \mathcal{C}^u} X.M$ is increased by at least one element of $\mathcal{Q}$. Each call of function `Get_structure` takes $O(n)$ time, since the set of components of $G \setminus N_G[x]$ can be computed only twice (once for u and once for v) and before entering each `do-while` loop. So, the two `do-while` loops take time $O(n^2)$. The creation of graph Γ takes $O(n^2)$ time. To see this note that Γ is the complement of a bipartite graph, so the time consuming operation is to compute edges between $\mathcal{C}^u$ and $\mathcal{C}^v$. For this, examine each vertex of G and if it belongs to two structures of different sides don't place the edge between them; place all the remaining edges. Finally, function `Check_clique` takes time $O(n^2)$, because its `while` loop is executed $O(n)$ times and the commands within the loop take $O(n)$ time. Particularly, to construct set K in linear time one has to build a correspondence between elements of $\mathcal{Q}$ and structures in $\mathcal{C}^v$ before the execution of the `while` loop so as to find in which structure each element of $\mathcal{Q}$ belongs to in constant time. Therefore, the time complexity of the algorithm is $O(n^4)$.

Let G be a graph and uv one of its edges. Based on the description of function

FT3SD5 in figure 5, one can produce all uv-concentrated tree 3-spanners of G. Indeed, as shown in the proof of correctness, each such spanner, corresponds to a choice of clique of structures L (note that $L = \emptyset$, when $\mathcal{Q} = \emptyset$) and to a choice of representative in each structure of L (set $X.R$ is the set of representatives of structure X). Also, each such spanner corresponds to a choice of edge set E' in function FT3SD5, which has to do with neighbors of u or v that do not participate in any structure of L. Note that there can be such spanners for which the corresponding set E' contains edges that are not incident to either u or v. There are no other parameters to built such a spanner; so, all uv-concentrated tree 3-spanners of G are listed by choosing clique, representative, and set E'. To build all the tree 3-spanners of G, one can start with xy-concentrated tree 3-spanners of G for each edge xy of G and then try alter only the down vertex adjacencies and set E'. The down vertices for each xy-concentrated tree 3-spanner T of G form set $\bigcup_{X \in L_T} X.D$, where L_T is the structure clique that corresponds to T.

Small diameter graphs admit small diameter tree spanners:

Lemma 6 *Let G be a graph of diameter at most 3. Then, if G admits a tree 3-spanner, then G admits a tree 3-spanner of diameter at most 5.*

Proof. Consider the tree 3-spanners of G of smallest diameter. Among these, let T be one that has the least number of vertex pairs at T distance equal to its diameter apart. Assume, towards a contradiction, that the diameter of T is strictly greater than 5. Let D be a diameter of T. Let a be the second vertex of path D and b be the second last vertex of path D. Clearly, $a \neq b$. Also, let u be the D neighbor of a towards b and let v be the D neighbor of b towards a. Again, since the diameter is at least 6, $u \neq v$. Finally, let w_a be the D neighbor of u towards b and let w_b be the D neighbor of v towards a. Again, $w_a \neq v$ and $w_b \neq u$. Though, it can be the case that $w_a = w_b$ (see figure 6).



Figure 6: Here, x, y are endpoints of a diameter of T. The dashed line corresponds to a T path of length at least 0; i.e. it may be that $w_a = w_b$. It may also be $a = p$ or $b = q$.

Let A be the T neighbors of a that are leaves and let B be the T neighbors of b that are leaves. All T neighbors of a but u must be leaves, because a is a second vertex of D. Also, all T neighbors of b but v must be leaves. Assume that a vertex $x \in A$ is adjacent to u in G. Since T is a tree 3-spanner of G, $N_G(x) \subseteq A \cup N_T[u]$. So, tree $T' = (T \setminus \{xa\}) \cup \{xu\}$ is a tree 3-spanner of G. But in the new tree x is moved closer to a center, so T' has fewer than T vertex

pairs at distance equal to its diameter apart; a contradiction. So $u \notin N_G(A)$. Similarly, $v \notin N_G(B)$.

Assume that some $x \in A$ is not adjacent to w_a in G and that some $y \in B$ is not adjacent to w_b in G. Since G has diameter at most 3, there is a path x, p, q, y in G, where p can be equal to q; note that x, y are too far apart in T to be adjacent in G. Since T is a tree 3-spanner of G, p must be in $(A \cup N_T(u)) \setminus \{w_a\}$; note that x is not adjacent in G to either of u or w_a. Similarly, q must be in $(B \cup N_T(v)) \setminus \{w_b\}$. If $p \in A$, then p cannot be a neighbor of q, because, then, the closest to y possibly neighbor of p is w_a and q cannot be equal to w_a, even if $w_a = w_b$. So, p must be in $N_T(u) \setminus \{w_a\}$. Similarly, q must be in $N_T(v) \setminus \{w_b\}$ (see figure 6). Then, $d_T(p, q) = d_T(p, u) + d_T(u, v) + d_T(v, q)$. But $d_T(u, v) \geq 2$; so, this is a contradiction, because p and q are adjacent in G and T is a tree 3-spanner of G. Therefore, all the vertices of A are adjacent in G to w_a or all the vertices of B are adjacent in G to w_b.

So, without loss of generality, all vertices of A are adjacent in G to w_a. Let T' be the tree $(T \setminus \bigcup_{z \in A}\{za\}) \cup \bigcup_{z \in A}\{zw_a\}$. Then, T' is a tree 3-spanner of G. But in the new tree x is moved closer to a center, so T' has fewer than T vertex pairs at distance equal to its diameter apart; a contradiction. □

Theorem 2 *There is an efficeint algorithm to decide whether a graph of diameter at most 3 admits a tree 3-spanner.*

Proof. Based on lemma 6 and theorem 1 algorithm `T3SD5(G)` in figure 1 decides tree 3-spanner admissibility of diameter at most 3 graphs. As noted earlier in this section this algorithm is efficient. □

Note that a graph G admits a tree 3-spanner if and only if every block of G admits a tree 3-spanner. So, algorithm `T3SD5(G)` can be employed to decide tree 3-spanner admissibility of bigger diameter graphs, as long as each block of the input graph has diameter at most 3.

A long standing open question is to determine the complexity status of the tree 3-spanner problem: given a graph decide whether it admits a tree 3-spanner, without any diameter restrictions. It seems that the algorithm presented in this paper can be used as a building block towards deciding tree 3-spanner admissible graphs. First, relaxing the diameter restriction and, therefore, finding tree 3-spanners of longer diameter, eventually the problem will be solved for any diameter and will cover all tree 3-spanner admissible graphs. Second, tree 3-spanner admissible graphs of diameter more than 3 should admit a star cut-set; i.e. a cut-set consisting of a vertex and some of its neighbors. So, it may be the case that deciding whether a graph G admits a tree 3-spanner is reduced to deciding the tree 3-spanner admissibility of a set of small diameter subgraphs of G.

References

[1] Srinivasa Arikati, Danny Z. Chen, L. Paul Chew, Gautam Das, Michiel Smid, and Christos D. Zaroliagis. Planar spanners and approximate short-

est path queries among obstacles in the plane. In *Algorithms—ESA '96 (Barcelona)*, pages 514–528. Springer, Berlin, 1996.

[2] Baruch Awerbuch. Complexity of network synchronization. *Journal of the ACM*, 32(4):804–823, October 1985.

[3] Hans-Jürgen Bandelt and Andreas Dress. Reconstructing the shape of a tree from observed dissimilarity data. *Adv. in Appl. Math.*, 7(3):309–343, 1986.

[4] J. A. Bondy. Trigraphs. *Discrete Mathematics*, 75:69–79, 1989.

[5] Andreas Brandstädt, Victor Chepoi, and Feodor Dragan. Distance approximating trees for chordal and dually chordal graphs. *J. Algorithms*, 30(1):166–184, 1999.

[6] Andreas Brandstädt, Feodor F. Dragan, Hoàng-Oanh Le, and Van Bang Le. Tree spanners on chordal graphs: complexity and algorithms. *Theor. Comput. Sci.*, 310(1-3):329–354, 2004.

[7] Leizhen Cai. *Tree Spanners: Spanning trees that approximate distances*. PhD thesis, Department of Computer Science, University of Toronto, 1992. (Available as Technical Report 260/92).

[8] Leizhen Cai and Derek G. Corneil. Tree spanners. *SIAM J. of Discrete Mathematics*, 8(3):359–378, 1995.

[9] L. Paul Chew. There are planar graphs almost as good as the complete graph. *J. Comput. System Sci.*, 39(2):205–219, 1989. Computational geometry.

[10] Feodor F. Dragan and Ekkehard Köhler. An approximation algorithm for the tree t-spanner problem on unweighted graphs via generalized chordal graphs. *Algorithmica*, 69(4):884–905, 2014.

[11] Yuval Emek and David Peleg. Approximating minimum max-stretch spanning trees on unweighted graphs. *SIAM J. Comput.*, 38(5):1761–1781, 2008.

[12] Jittat Fakcharoenphol, Satish Rao, and Kunal Talwar. A tight bound on approximating arbitrary metrics by tree metrics. *Journal of Computer and System Sciences*, 69(3):485 – 497, 2004. Special Issue on {STOC} 2003.

[13] Sándor P. Fekete and Jana Kremer. Tree spanners in planar graphs. *Discrete Appl. Math.*, 108(1-2):85–103, 2001. International Workshop on Graph-Theoretic Concepts in Computer Science (Smolenice Castle, 1998).

[14] Hoàng-Oanh Le and Van Bang Le. Optimal tree 3-spanners in directed path graphs. *Networks*, 34(2):81–87, 1999.

[15] M. S. Mandanlal, G. Venkatesan, and C. Pandu Rangan. Tree 3-spanners on interval, permutation, and regular bipartite graphs. *Information Processing Letters*, 59:97–102, 1996.

[16] Paul Manuel, Bharati Rajan, Indra Rajasingh, and Amutha Alaguvel. Tree spanners, cayley graphs, and diametrically uniform graphs. In *Graph-Theoretic Concepts in Computer Science, 29th International Workshop, WG 2003, Elspeet, The Netherlands, June 19-21, 2003, Revised Papers*, pages 334–345, 2003.

[17] Giri Narasimhan and Michiel Smid. *Geometric Spanner Networks*. Cambridge University Press, New York, NY, USA, 2007.

[18] Ioannis Papoutsakis. *Tree Spanners of simple graphs*. PhD thesis, Department of Computer Science, University of Toronto, 2013. (Available at university T-space on the internet).

[19] Ioannis Papoutsakis. Tree spanners of small diameter. *CoRR*, abs/1503.06063, 2014.

[20] Ioannis Papoutsakis. Tree spanners of bounded degree graphs. *CoRR*, abs/1503.06822, 2015.

[21] D. Peleg and E. Upfal. A tradeoff between space and efficiency for routing tables. In *STOC: ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing (STOC)*, 1988.

[22] David Peleg and Eilon Reshef. A variant of the arrow distributed directory with low average complexity (extended abstract). In *Automata, languages and programming (Prague, 1999)*, pages 615–624. Springer, Berlin, 1999.

[23] David Peleg and Jeffrey D. Ullman. An optimal synchronizer for the hypercube. *SIAM J. Comput.*, 18(4):740–747, 1989.

[24] S. Pettie. Low distortion spanners. *ACM Transactions on Algorithms*, 6(1), 2009.

[25] Y. Rabinovich and R. Raz. Lower bounds on the distortion of embedding finite metric spaces in graphs. *Discrete Comput. Geom.*, 19(1):79–94, 1998.

[26] Daniel A. Spielman and Shang-Hua Teng. Nearly-linear time algorithms for graph partitioning, graph sparsification, and solving linear systems. In *Proceedings of the Thirty-sixth Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing*, STOC '04, pages 81–90, New York, NY, USA, 2004. ACM.

[27] G. Venkatesan, U. Rotics, M. S. Madanlal, J. A. Makowsky, and C. Pandu Rangan. Restrictions of minimum spanner problems. *Information and Computation*, 136(2):143–164, 1997.

[28] D. B. West. *Introduction to Graph Theory*. Prentice Hall, Inc., 1996.